

THE HÖRMANDER MULTIPLIER THEOREM, II: THE BILINEAR LOCAL L^2 CASE

LOUKAS GRAFAKOS, DANQING HE, AND PETR HONZIK

ABSTRACT. We use wavelets of tensor product type to obtain the boundedness of bilinear multiplier operators on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$ associated with Hörmander multipliers on \mathbb{R}^{2n} with minimal smoothness. We focus on the local L^2 case and we obtain boundedness under the minimal smoothness assumption of $n/2$ derivatives. We also provide counterexamples to obtain necessary conditions for all sets of indices.

1. INTRODUCTION

An m -linear (p_1, \dots, p_m, p) multiplier $\sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m)$ is a function on $\mathbb{R}^n \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that the corresponding m -linear operator

$$T_\sigma(f_1, \dots, f_m)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{mn}} \sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \widehat{f}_1(\xi_1) \cdots \widehat{f}_m(\xi_m) e^{2\pi i x \cdot (\xi_1 + \dots + \xi_m)} d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_m,$$

initially defined on m -tuples of Schwartz functions, has a bounded extension from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \dots \times L^{p_m}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for appropriate p_1, \dots, p_m, p .

It is known from the work in [2] for $p > 1$ and [13], [11] for $p \leq 1$, that the classical Mihlin condition on σ in \mathbb{R}^{mn} yields boundedness for T_σ from $L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \dots \times L^{p_m}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ for all $1 < p_1, \dots, p_m \leq \infty$, $1/m < p = (1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_m)^{-1} < \infty$. The Mihlin condition in this setting is usually referred to as the Coifman-Meyer condition and the associated multipliers bear the same names as well. The Coifman-Meyer condition cannot be weakened to the Marcinkiewicz condition, as the latter fails in the multilinear setting; see [8]. Related multilinear multiplier theorems with mixed smoothness (but not necessarily minimal) can be found in [15], [16], [7].

A natural question on Hörmander type multipliers is how the minimal smoothness s interplays with the range of p 's on which boundedness is expected. In the linear case, this question was studied in [1], [17], and [6]. Let $L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the Sobolev space consisting of all functions h such that $(I - \Delta)^{s/2}(h) \in L^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$, where Δ is the Laplacian. In the first paper of this series [6], we showed that the conditions $|1/2 - 1/p| < s/n$ and $rs > n$ imply $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ boundedness for $1 < p < \infty$ for T_σ in the linear case $m = 1$, when the multiplier σ lies in the Sobolev space $L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^n)$ uniformly over all annuli. This

The first author was supported by the Simons Foundation. The third author was supported by the ERC CZ grant LL1203 of the Czech Ministry of Education.

Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 42B15. Secondary 42B25.

Keywords and phrases: Bilinear multipliers, Hörmander multipliers, wavelets, multilinear operators.

minimal smoothness problem in the bilinear setting was first studied in [18] and later in [15] and [9]. These references contain necessary conditions on s when the multiplier in the Sobolev space L_s^r with $r = 2$; other values of r were considered in [10].

Our goal here is to pursue the analogous bilinear question. In this paper we focus on the boundedness of T_σ in the local L^2 case, i.e., the situation where $1 \leq p_1, p_2 \leq 2$ and $1 \leq p = 1/(1/p_1 + 1/p_2) \leq 2$ under minimal smoothness conditions on s . It turns out that to express our result in an optimal fashion, we need to work with $r > 2$. We also work with the case $L^2 \times L^2 \rightarrow L^1$ as boundedness in the remaining local L^2 indices follows by duality and interpolation. We achieve our goal via new technique to study boundedness for bilinear operators based on tensor product wavelet decomposition developed in [5]; this technique was recently used to solve other problems; see [12].

The main result of this paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Suppose $\widehat{\psi} \in \mathcal{C}_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ is positive and supported in the annulus $\{(\xi, \eta) : 1/2 \leq |(\xi, \eta)| \leq 2\}$ such that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \widehat{\psi}_j(\xi, \eta) = \sum_j \widehat{\psi}(2^{-j}(\xi, \eta)) = 1$ for $(\xi, \eta) \neq 0$. Let $1 < r < \infty$, $s > \max\{n/2, 2n/r\}$, and suppose there is a constant A such that*

$$(1) \quad \sup_j \|\sigma(2^j \cdot) \widehat{\psi}\|_{L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} \leq A < \infty.$$

Then there is a constant $C = C(n, \Psi)$ such that the bilinear operator

$$T_\sigma(f, g)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} \sigma(\xi, \eta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \widehat{g}(\eta) e^{2\pi i x \cdot (\xi + \eta)} d\xi d\eta,$$

initially defined on Schwartz functions f and g , satisfies

$$(2) \quad \|T_\sigma(f, g)\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq CA \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)}.$$

The optimality of (1) in the preceding theorem is contained in the following result.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that for $0 < p_1, \dots, p_m < \infty$, $p = (1/p_1 + \dots + 1/p_m)^{-1}$, we have*

$$(3) \quad \|T_\sigma\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \dots \times L^{p_m}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\sigma(2^j \cdot) \widehat{\Psi}\|_{L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^{mn})}$$

for all bounded functions σ for which $\sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\sigma(2^j \cdot) \widehat{\Psi}\|_{L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^{mn})} < \infty$ (for some fixed $r, s > 0$). Then we must necessarily have $s \geq \max\{(m-1)n/2, mn/r\}$.

Finally, we have another set of necessary conditions for the boundedness of m -linear multipliers. The sufficiency of these conditions is shown in the third paper of this series.

Theorem 3. *Suppose there exists a constant C such that (3) holds for all σ such that the right hand side is finite. Then we must necessarily have*

$$\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{s}{n} + \sum_{i \in I} \left(\frac{1}{p_i} - \frac{1}{2} \right),$$

where I is an arbitrary subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ which may also be empty (in which case the sum is supposed to be zero).

2. PRELIMINARIES

We utilize wavelets with compact supports. Their existence is due to Daubechies [3] and their construction is contained in Meyer's book [14] and Daubechies' book [4]. For our purposes we need product type smooth wavelets with compact supports; the construction of such objects we use here can be found in Triebel [19, Proposition 1.53].

Lemma 4. *For any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist real compactly supported functions $\psi_F, \psi_M \in C^k(\mathbb{R})$, the class of functions with continuous derivatives of order up to k , which satisfy that $\|\psi_F\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = \|\psi_M\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} = 1$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} x^\alpha \psi_M(x) dx = 0$ for $0 \leq \alpha \leq k$, such that, if Ψ^G is defined by*

$$\Psi^G(\vec{x}) = \psi_{G_1}(x_1) \cdots \psi_{G_{2n}}(x_{2n})$$

for $G = (G_1, \dots, G_{2n})$ in the set

$$\mathcal{I} := \left\{ (G_1, \dots, G_{2n}) : G_i \in \{F, M\} \right\},$$

then the family of functions

$$\bigcup_{\vec{\mu} \in \mathbb{Z}^{2n}} \left[\left\{ \Psi^{(F, \dots, F)}(\vec{x} - \vec{\mu}) \right\} \cup \bigcup_{\lambda=0}^{\infty} \left\{ 2^{\lambda n} \Psi^G(2^\lambda \vec{x} - \vec{\mu}) : G \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{(F, \dots, F)\} \right\} \right]$$

forms an orthonormal basis of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$, where $\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{2n})$.

In order to prove our results, we use the wavelet characterization of Sobolev spaces, following Triebel's book [19]. Let us fix the smoothness s , for our purposes we always have $s \leq n + 1$. Also, we only work with spaces with the integrability index $r > 1$. Take ϕ as a smooth function defined on \mathbb{R}^{2n} such that $\widehat{\phi}$ is supported in the unit annulus such that $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \widehat{\phi}_j = 1$, where $\widehat{\phi}_j = \widehat{\phi}(2^{-j} \cdot)$ for $j \geq 1$ and $\widehat{\phi}_0 = \sum_{k \leq 0} \widehat{\phi}(2^{-k} \cdot)$. Then for a distribution $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ we define the $F_{r,q}^s$ norm as follows:

$$\|f\|_{F_{r,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^{2n})} = \left\| \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 2^{jsq} |(\phi_j \widehat{f})^\vee(\cdot)|^q \right)^{1/q} \right\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}.$$

We then pick wavelets with smoothness and cancellation degrees $k = 6n$. This number suffices for the purposes of the following lemma.

Lemma 5 ([19, Theorem 1.64]). *Let $0 < r < \infty$, $0 < q \leq \infty$, $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and for $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\vec{\mu} \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}$ let $\chi_{\lambda \vec{\mu}}$ be the characteristic function of the cube $Q_{\lambda \vec{\mu}}$ centered at $2^{-\lambda} \vec{\mu}$ with length $2^{1-\lambda}$. For a sequence $\gamma = \{\gamma_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G}\}$ define the norm*

$$\|\gamma\|_{f_{r,q}^s} = \left\| \left(\sum_{\lambda, G, \vec{\mu}} 2^{\lambda sq} |\gamma_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} \chi_{\lambda \vec{\mu}}(\cdot)|^q \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^r(\mathbb{R}^{2n})}.$$

Let $\mathbb{N} \ni k > \max\{s, \frac{4n}{\min(r,q)} + n - s\}$. Let $\Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G}$ be the $2n$ -dimensional Daubechies wavelets with smoothness k according Lemma 4. Let $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. Then $f \in F_{r,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$

if and only if it can be represented as

$$f = \sum_{\lambda, G, \vec{\mu}} \gamma_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} 2^{-\lambda n} \Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G}$$

with $\|\gamma|f_{rq}^s\| < \infty$ with unconditional convergence in $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Furthermore this representation is unique,

$$\gamma_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} = 2^{\lambda n} \langle f, \Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} \rangle,$$

and

$$I : f \rightarrow \{2^{\lambda n} \langle f, \Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} \rangle\}$$

is an isomorphic map of $F_{r,q}^s(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ onto $f_{r,q}^s$.

In particular, the Sobolev space $L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$ coincides with $F_{r,2}^s(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$. In the proof of our results, we use for fixed λ the following estimate:

$$(4) \quad \left\| \left(\sum_{G, \vec{\mu}} |\langle \sigma, \Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} \rangle \Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\sigma\|_{L_s^r} 2^{-s\lambda}.$$

To verify this, by Lemma 5, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{G, \vec{\mu}} 2^{\lambda s} |\gamma_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} \chi_{Q_{\lambda, \vec{\mu}}}| \right\|_{L^r} \leq C \|\sigma\|_{L_s^r},$$

with $\gamma_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} = 2^{\lambda n} \langle \sigma, \Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G} \rangle$. Notice that $2^{-\lambda n} \Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G}$ are L^∞ normalized wavelets, and there exists an absolute constant B such that the support of $\Psi_{\vec{\mu}}^{\lambda, G}$ is always contained in $\cup_{|\vec{v}| \leq B} Q_{\lambda, \vec{\mu} + \vec{v}}$. This then implies (4).

3. THE MAIN LEMMA

Let Q denote the cube $[-2, 2]^{2n}$ in \mathbb{R}^{2n} , and consider a Sobolev space $L_s^r(Q)$ as the Sobolev space of distributions supported in Q which are in $L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^{2n})$.

Lemma 6. *For $r \in (1, \infty)$ let $s > \max(n/2, 2n/r)$ and suppose $\sigma \in L_s^r(Q)$. Then σ is a bilinear multiplier bounded from $L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ to $L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$.*

Proof. The important inequality is the one for a single generation of wavelets (with λ fixed). For a fixed λ , by the uniform compact supports of the elements in the basis, we can classify the wavelets into finitely many subclasses such that the supports of the elements in each subclass are pairwise disjoint. We denote by $D_{\lambda, \kappa}$ such a subclass and the related symbol

$$\sigma_{\lambda, \kappa} = \sum_{\omega \in D_{\lambda, \kappa}} a_\omega \omega,$$

where $a_\omega = \langle \sigma, \omega \rangle$. The ω 's are L^2 normalized, but we change the normalization to L^r , i.e. we consider $\tilde{\omega} = \omega / \|\omega\|_{L^r}$ and $b_\omega = a_\omega \|\omega\|_{L^r}$. We have

$$\sigma_{\lambda, \kappa} = \sum_{\omega \in D_{\lambda, \kappa}} b_\omega \tilde{\omega}$$

and from the Sobolev smoothness and the fact that the supports of the wavelets do not overlap, with the aid of (4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \left(\sum_{\omega \in D_{\lambda, \kappa}} |b_\omega|^r \right)^{1/r} = \left(\sum_{\omega} \int \left(|a_\omega \omega|^2 \right)^{r/2} dx \right)^{1/r} \\ &\leq \left\| \left(\sum_{\omega} |a_\omega \omega|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^r} \\ &\leq C \|\sigma\|_{L^r_s} 2^{-s\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, each ω in $D_{\lambda, \kappa}$ is of the form $\omega = \omega_k \omega_l$ with $\vec{\mu} = (k, l)$, where k and l both range over index sets U_1 and U_2 of cardinality at most $C2^{\lambda n}$. Moreover we denote by b_{kl} the coefficient b_ω , and we have

$$\sigma_{\lambda, \kappa} = \sum_{k \in U_1} \tilde{\omega}_k \sum_{l \in U_2} b_{kl} \tilde{\omega}_l.$$

Set τ_{\max} to be the positive number such that $2n\lambda/r \leq \tau_{\max} < 1 + 2n\lambda/r$. For a non-negative number $\tau < 2n\lambda/r = \tau_{\max}$ and a positive constant (depending on τ) $K = 2^{\tau r/2}$ we introduce the following decomposition: We define the level set according to b as

$$D_{\lambda, \kappa}^\tau = \{\omega \in D_{\lambda, \kappa} : B2^{-\tau} < |b_\omega| \leq B2^{-\tau+1}\},$$

when $\tau < \tau_{\max}$. We also define the set

$$D_{\lambda, \kappa}^{\tau_{\max}} = \{\omega \in D_{\lambda, \kappa} : |b_\omega| \leq B2^{-\tau_{\max}+1}\}.$$

We now take the part with heavy columns

$$D_{\lambda, \kappa}^{\tau, 1} = \{\omega_k \omega_l \in D_{\lambda, \kappa}^\tau : \text{card}\{s : \omega_k \omega_s \in D_{\lambda, \kappa}^\tau\} \geq K\},$$

and the remainder

$$D_{\lambda, \kappa}^{\tau, 2} = D_{\lambda, \kappa}^\tau \setminus D_{\lambda, \kappa}^{\tau, 1}.$$

We also use the following notations for the index sets: $U_1^{\tau, 1}$ is the set of k 's such that $\omega_k \omega_l$ in $D_{\lambda, \kappa}^{\tau, 1}$, and for each $k \in U_1^{\tau, 1}$ we denote $U_{2, k}^{\tau, 1}$ the set of corresponding second indices l 's such that $\omega_k \omega_l \in D_{\lambda, \kappa}^{\tau, 1}$, whose cardinality is at least K . We also denote

$$\sigma_{\lambda, \kappa}^{\tau, 1} = \sum_{k \in U_1^{\tau, 1}} \tilde{\omega}_k \sum_{l \in U_{2, k}^{\tau, 1}} b_{kl} \tilde{\omega}_l,$$

thus summing over the wavelets in the set $D_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,1}$. The symbol $\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,2}$ is then defined by summation over $D_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,2}$.

We first treat the part $\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,1}$. Denote $\gamma = \text{card } U_1^{\tau,1}$. For $\tau < \tau_{\max}$ the ℓ^r -norm of the part of the sequence $\{b_{kl}\}$ indexed by the set $D_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,1}$ is comparable to

$$C \left(\sum_{k \in U_1^{\tau,1}} \sum_{l \in U_{2,k}^{\tau,1}} (B2^{-\tau})^r \right)^{1/r}$$

which is at least as big as $C(\gamma K(B2^{-\tau})^r)^{1/r}$. However this ℓ^r -norm is smaller than B , therefore we get $\gamma \leq C2^{\tau r}/K = C2^{\tau r/2}$. For $\tau = \tau_{\max}$ we trivially have that $\gamma \leq C2^{n\lambda} = C2^{\tau_{\max} r/2}$.

For $f, g \in \mathcal{S}$ we estimate the multiplier norm of $\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,1}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,1} \widehat{f} \widehat{g})\|_{L^1} &\leq \sum_{k \in U_1^{\tau,1}} \|\widehat{f} \tilde{\omega}_k\|_{L^2} \sum_{l \in U_{2,k}^{\tau,1}} b_{kl} \tilde{\omega}_l \widehat{g} \|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k \in U_1^{\tau,1}} \|\widehat{f} \tilde{\omega}_k\|_{L^2} \sup_l |b_{kl}| 2^{\lambda n/r} \|g\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq C 2^{\lambda n/r} \|g\|_{L^2} \left(\sum_k \sup_l |b_{kl}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_k \|\widehat{f} \tilde{\omega}_k\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

In view of orthogonality and of the fact that $\|\tilde{\omega}_k\|_{L^\infty} \approx 2^{\lambda n/r}$ we obtain the inequality

$$\left(\sum_k \|\widehat{f} \tilde{\omega}_k\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq C 2^{\frac{\lambda n}{r}} \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

By the definition of $U_1^{\tau,1}$ we have also that

$$\left(\sum_k \sup_l |b_{kl}|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq B 2^{-\tau} \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Collecting these estimates, we deduce

$$(5) \quad \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,1} \widehat{f} \widehat{g})\|_{L^1} \leq C \|\sigma\|_{L_s^r} \gamma^{\frac{1}{2}} 2^{\lambda(\frac{2n}{r}-s)} 2^{-\tau} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

The set $D_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,2}$ has the property that in each column there are at most K elements. Let us denote by V^2 the index set of all second indices such that $\tilde{\omega}_k \tilde{\omega}_l \in D_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,2}$, and for each $l \in V^2$ set $V^{1,l}$ the corresponding sets of first indices. Thus

$$D_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,2} = \{\omega_k \omega_l : l \in V^2, k \in V^{1,l}\}.$$

We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,2}\widehat{f}\widehat{g})\|_{L^1} &\leq \sum_{l \in V^2} \left\| \sum_{k \in V^{1,l}} b_{kl} \tilde{\omega}_k \widehat{f} \right\|_{L^2} \|\tilde{\omega}_l \widehat{g}\|_{L^2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{l \in V^2} \left\| \sum_{k \in V^{1,l}} b_{kl} \tilde{\omega}_k \widehat{f} \right\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{l \in V^2} \|\tilde{\omega}_l \widehat{g}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

We need to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{l \in V^2} \left\| \sum_{k \in V^{1,l}} b_{kl} \tilde{\omega}_k \widehat{f} \right\|_{L^2}^2 &\leq C \int_Q \sum_{l \in V^2} \sum_{k \in V^{1,l}} B^2 2^{-2\tau} |\tilde{\omega}_k|^2 |\widehat{f}(\xi_1)|^2 d\xi_1 \\ &\leq CK 2^{\frac{2n\lambda}{r}} B^2 2^{-2\tau} \|f\|_{L^2}^2, \end{aligned}$$

since, by the disjointness of the supports of $\tilde{\omega}_k$, $\sum_k |\tilde{\omega}_k|^2 \leq C 2^{2n\lambda/r}$, and the cardinality of V^2 is controlled by K .

Returning to our estimate, and using orthogonality, we obtain

$$(6) \quad \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau,2}\widehat{f}\widehat{g})\|_{L^1} \leq C \|\sigma\|_{L_s^r} K^{\frac{1}{2}} 2^{-s\lambda} 2^{-\tau} 2^{\frac{2\lambda n}{r}} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

For any $\tau \leq \tau_{\max}$ the two inequalities (5) and (6) are the same due to $\gamma \leq C 2^{\tau r}/K = C 2^{\tau r/2}$. Therefore, we have

$$(7) \quad \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau}\widehat{f}\widehat{g})\|_{L^1} \leq C \|\sigma\|_{L_s^r} 2^{(\frac{r}{4}-1)\tau} 2^{\lambda(\frac{2n}{r}-s)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

The right hand side has a negative exponent in λ since $s > 2n/r$.

The behavior in τ depends on r . For $1 < r < 4$ it is a geometric series in τ and hence summing over $0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_{\max}$ and $\lambda \geq 0$ is finite. However, if $r \geq 4$, we need to use the following observation:

$$\sum_{\tau=0}^{\tau_{\max}} 2^{(\frac{r}{4}-1)\tau} \leq C \tau_{\max} 2^{(\frac{r}{4}-1)\tau_{\max}} \leq C \left(\frac{2n\lambda}{r}\right) 2^{(\frac{r}{4}-1)\frac{2n\lambda}{r}}.$$

Therefore, by summing over τ in (7) we obtain

$$\sum_{\tau=0}^{\tau_{\max}} \|\mathcal{F}^{-1}(\sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}^{\tau}\widehat{f}\widehat{g})\|_{L^1} \leq C \|\sigma\|_{L_s^r} \left(\frac{2n\lambda}{r}\right) 2^{(\frac{r}{4}-1)(1+\frac{2n\lambda}{r})} 2^{\lambda(\frac{2n}{r}-s)} \|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}.$$

Since $(2n\lambda/r) 2^{(r/4-1)2n\lambda/r} 2^{\lambda(2n/r-s)} = (2n\lambda/r) 2^{\lambda(n/2-s)}$, these estimates form a summable series in λ only if $s > n/2$.

We have $1 \leq \kappa \leq C_n$ and $\sigma = \sum_{\lambda=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\kappa} \sigma_{\lambda,\kappa}$. Therefore for s and r related as in $s > \max(2n/r, n/2)$ we have convergent series, and we obtain the result by summation in τ first and then in λ . \square

Remark 1. We see from the proof (or by an easy dilation argument) that the condition Q is $[-2, 2]^n$ is not essential and the statement keeps valid when Q is any fixed compact set.

4. THE PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof. We use an idea developed in [5], where we consider off-diagonal and diagonal cases separately. For the former we use the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function and a “square” function, and for the latter we use Lemma 6 in Section 3.

We introduce notation needed to study these cases appropriately. We define $\sigma_j(\xi, \eta) = \sigma(\xi, \eta) \widehat{\psi}(2^{-j}(\xi, \eta))$ and write $m_j(\xi, \eta) = \sigma_j(2^j(\xi, \eta))$. We note that all m_j are supported in the unit annulus, the dyadic annulus centered at zero with radius comparable to 1, and $\|m_j\|_{L^r_s} \leq A$ uniformly in j by assumption (1).

By the discussion in the previous section, for each m_j we have the decomposition $m_j(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{\kappa} \sum_{\lambda} \sum_{k,l} b_{k,l} \tilde{\omega}_k(\xi) \tilde{\omega}_l(\eta) = \sum_{\lambda} m_{j,\lambda}$ with $\tilde{\omega}_k \approx 2^{\lambda n/r}$ and $(\sum_{k,l} |b_{k,l}|^r)^{1/r} \leq CA2^{-\lambda s}$. Assume that both Ψ_F and Ψ_M are supported in $B(0, N)$ for some large fixed number N . We define the off-diagonal parts

$$m_{j,\lambda}^2(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{\kappa} \sum_k \sum_{|l| \leq 2\sqrt{n}N} b_{k,l} \tilde{\omega}_k(\xi) \tilde{\omega}_l(\eta)$$

and

$$m_{j,\lambda}^3(\xi, \eta) = \sum_{\kappa} \sum_l \sum_{|k| \leq 2\sqrt{n}N} b_{k,l} \tilde{\omega}_k(\xi) \tilde{\omega}_l(\eta),$$

then the remainder in the λ level is $m_{j,\lambda}^1(\xi, \eta) = [m_{j,\lambda} - m_{j,\lambda}^2 - m_{j,\lambda}^3](\xi, \eta)$ with each wavelet involved away from the axes. Moreover for $i = 1, 2, 3$, we define $m_j^i = \sum_{\lambda} m_{j,\lambda}^i$, $\sigma_j^i = m_j^i(2^{-j} \cdot)$, $\sigma^i = \sum_j \sigma_j^i$. Notice that σ is equal to the sum $\sigma^1 + \sigma^2 + \sigma^3$.

(i) *The Off-diagonal Cases*

We consider the off-diagonal cases $m_{j,\lambda}^2$ and $m_{j,\lambda}^3$ first. By symmetry, it suffices to consider

$$T_{m_{j,\lambda}^2}(f, g)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2n}} m_{j,\lambda}^2(\xi, \eta) \widehat{f}(\xi) \widehat{g}(\eta) e^{2\pi i x(\xi + \eta)} d\xi d\eta.$$

By the definition $\tilde{\omega}_l = 2^{\lambda n/2} \Psi(2^{\lambda} x - l) / \|\omega_l\|_{L^r}$, we have $|(\tilde{\omega}_l \widehat{g})^{\vee}(x)| \leq C2^{\lambda n/r} M(g)(x)$, where $M(g)(x)$ is the Hardy-Littlewood maximal function. Recall the boundedness of $b_{k,l}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_k$, we therefore have

$$|(\sum_k b_{k,l} \tilde{\omega}_k \widehat{f})^{\vee}| \leq 2^{\lambda(n/r-s)} |(m \widehat{f} \chi_{1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2})^{\vee}|$$

with $\|m\|_{L^{\infty}} \leq C$. In view of the finiteness of N and the number of κ 's, we finally obtain a pointwise control

$$|T_{m_{j,\lambda}^2}(f, g)(x)| \leq C2^{(2n/r-s)\lambda} |T_m(f')(x)| M(g)(x),$$

where $\widehat{f'} = \widehat{f} \chi_{1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2}$.

Observe that

$$T_{\sigma_j^2}(f, g)(x) = 2^{jn} T_{m_j^2}(f_j, g_j)(2^j x)$$

with $\widehat{f}_j(\xi) = 2^{jn/2} f(2^j \xi) \chi_{1/2 \leq |\xi| \leq 2}$ and $\widehat{g}_j(\xi) = 2^{jn/2} \widehat{g}(2^j \xi)$. Note that we did not define f_j and g_j in similar ways. By a standard argument using the square function characterization of the Hardy space H^1 , we control $\|T_{\sigma^2}(f, g)\|_{L^1}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \left(\sum_j |T_{\sigma_j^2}(f, g)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^1} &= \left\| \left(\sum_j |2^{jn} T_{m_j^2}(f_j, g_j)(2^j \cdot)|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq \sum_{\lambda} 2^{(2n/r-s)\lambda} \|g\|_{L^2} \left(\int \sum_j |\widehat{f}_j(\xi)|^2 d\xi \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Because of the definition of \widehat{f}_j , we see that

$$\int \sum_j |\widehat{f}_j(\xi)|^2 d\xi = \int \sum_j |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 \chi_{2^{j-1} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{j+1}} d\xi \leq C \|f\|_{L^2}^2.$$

The exponential decay in λ given by the condition $rs > 2n$ then concludes the proof of the off-diagonal cases.

(ii) *The Diagonal Case*

This case is relatively simple by an argument similar to the diagonal part in [5], because we have dealt with the key ingredient in Lemma 6. We give a brief proof here for completeness. By dilation we have that

$$\|T_{\sigma^1}(f, g)(x)\|_{L^1} \leq \left\| \sum_j \sum_{\lambda} T_{\sigma_{j,\lambda}^1}(f, g) \right\|_{L^1} \leq \sum_{\lambda} \sum_j \|2^{jn} T_{m_{j,\lambda}^1}(f_j, g_j)(2^j \cdot)\|_{L^1},$$

where $\widehat{f}_j(\xi) = 2^{jn/2} \widehat{f}(2^{jn} \xi) \chi_{C2^{-\lambda} \leq |\xi| \leq 2}(\xi)$ because in the support of $m_{j,\lambda}^1$ we have $C2^{-\lambda} \leq |\xi| \leq 2$, and g_j is defined similarly. For the last line we apply Lemma 6 and obtain, when $r \geq 4$, the estimate

$$\sum_{\lambda} C \frac{2n\lambda}{r} 2^{\lambda(n/2-s)} \sum_j \|\widehat{f}_j\|_{L^2} \|\widehat{g}_j\|_{L^2} \leq \sum_{\lambda} C \frac{2n\lambda}{r} 2^{\lambda(n/2-s)} \left(\sum_j \|\widehat{f}_j\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_j \|\widehat{g}_j\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

And when $r < 4$, we have a similar control

$$\sum_{\lambda} C 2^{\lambda(2n/r-s)} \sum_j \|\widehat{f}_j\|_{L^2} \|\widehat{g}_j\|_{L^2} \leq \sum_{\lambda} C 2^{\lambda(2n/r-s)} \left(\sum_j \|\widehat{f}_j\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_j \|\widehat{g}_j\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Observe that

$$\sum_j \|\widehat{f}_j\|_{L^2}^2 = \int |\widehat{f}(\xi)|^2 \sum_j \chi_{2^{-\lambda-j} \leq |\xi| \leq 2^{1-j}}(\xi) d\xi \leq C \lambda \|f\|_{L^2}^2,$$

so in either case with the restriction $s > \max\{n/2, 2n/r\}$ the sum over λ is controlled by $\|f\|_{L^2} \|g\|_{L^2}$. Thus we conclude the proof of the diagonal case and of Theorem 1. \square

5. NECESSARY CONDITIONS

For a bounded function σ , let T_σ be the m -linear multiplier operator with symbol σ . In this section we obtain examples for m -linear multiplier operators that impose restrictions on the indices and the smoothness in order to have

$$(8) \quad \|T_\sigma\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R}^n) \times \dots \times L^{p_m}(\mathbb{R}^n) \rightarrow L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \leq C \sup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \|\sigma(2^j \cdot) \widehat{\Psi}\|_{L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^{mn})}.$$

These conditions show in particular that the restriction on s in Theorem 1 is necessary.

We first prove Theorem 2 via two counterexamples; these are contained in Proposition 7 and Proposition 9, respectively.

Proposition 7. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 2 we must have $s \geq (m-1)n/2$.*

Proof. We use the bilinear case with dimension one to demonstrate the idea first. Then we easily extend the argument to higher dimensions.

We fix a Schwartz function ϕ with $\widehat{\phi}$ supported in $[-1/100, 1/100]$. Let $\{a_j(t)\}_j$ be a sequence of Rademacher functions indexed by positive integers, and for $N > 1$ define

$$\widehat{f_N}(\xi_1) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_j(t_1) \widehat{\phi}(N\xi_1 - j), \quad \widehat{g_N}(\xi_2) = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(t_2) \widehat{\phi}(N\xi_2 - k).$$

Let ϕ be a smooth function ϕ supported in $[-\frac{1}{10}, \frac{1}{10}]$ assuming value 1 in $[-\frac{1}{20}, \frac{1}{20}]$. We construct the multiplier σ_N of the bilinear operator T_N as follows,

$$(9) \quad \sigma_N = \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N a_j(t_1) a_k(t_2) a_{j+k}(t_3) c_{j+k} \phi(N\xi_1 - j) \phi(N\xi_2 - k),$$

where $c_l = 1$ when $9N/10 \leq l \leq 11N/10$ and 0 elsewhere. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} T_N(f_N, g_N)(x) &= \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N a_{j+k}(t_3) c_{j+k} \frac{1}{N^2} \phi(x/N) \phi(x/N) e^{2\pi i x(j+k)/N} \\ &= \sum_{l=2}^{2N} \sum_{k=s_l}^{S_l} a_l(t_3) c_l \frac{1}{N^2} \phi(x/N) \phi(x/N) e^{2\pi i x l/N}, \end{aligned}$$

where $s_l = \max(1, l-N)$ and $S_l = \min(N, l-1)$. We estimate $\|f_N\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R})}$, $\|g_N\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R})}$, $\|\sigma_N\|_{L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^2)}$ and $\|T_N(f_N, g_N)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})}$.

First we prove that $\|f_N\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R})} \approx N^{1-\frac{p_1}{2}}$. By Khinchine's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \|f_N\|_{L^{p_1}}^{p_1} dt_1 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_0^1 \left| \sum_{j=1}^N a_j(t_1) \frac{\phi(x/N)}{N} e^{2\pi i x j/N} \right|^{p_1} dt_1 dx \\ &\approx \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \left| \frac{\phi(x/N)}{N} \right|^2 \right)^{p_1/2} dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\approx N^{-p_1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\varphi(x/N)|^{p_1} dx \\ &\approx N^{1-\frac{p_1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\|f_N\|_{L^{p_1}(\mathbb{R} \times [0,1], dx dt)} \approx N^{\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{2}}$. Similarly $\|g_N\|_{L^{p_2}(\mathbb{R} \times [0,1], dx dt)} \approx N^{\frac{1}{p_2}-\frac{1}{2}}$. The same idea gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \|T_N(f_N, g_N)\|_{L^p}^p dt_3 &\approx \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{l=2}^{2N} |c_l(S_l - s_l) \frac{1}{N^2} \varphi^2(x/N) e^{2\pi i x l/N}|^2 \right)^{p/2} dx \\ &\approx \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{l=9N/10}^{11N/10} (S_l - s_l)^2 \right)^{p/2} \frac{1}{N^{2p}} |\varphi(x/N)|^{2p} dx \\ &\approx N^{\frac{3p}{2}-2p} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\varphi(x/N)|^{2p} dx \\ &\approx N^{1-\frac{p}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words we showed that $\|T_N(f_N, g_N)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R} \times [0,1], dx dt)} \approx N^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}}$.

As for σ_N , we have the following result whose proof can be found in [6, Lemma 4.2].

Lemma 8. *For the multiplier σ_N defined in (9) and any $s \in (0, 1)$, there exists a constant C_s such that*

$$(10) \quad \|\sigma_N\|_{L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^2)} \leq C_s N^s.$$

Apply (3) to f_N , g_N and T_N defined above and integrate with respect to t_1 , t_2 and t_3 on both sides, we have

$$\left(\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \|T_N(f_N, g_N)\|_{L^p}^p dt_3 dt_1 dt_2 \right)^{1/p} \leq C_s N^s \left(\int_0^1 \|f_N\|_{L^{p_1}}^p dt_1 \int_0^1 \|g_N\|_{L^{p_2}}^p dt_2 \right)^{1/p},$$

which combining the estimates obtained on f_N , g_N and $T_N(f_N, g_N)$ above implies

$$N^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_s N^s N^{\frac{1}{p_1}-\frac{1}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{p_2}-\frac{1}{2}},$$

so we automatically have $N^{1/2} \leq C_s N^s$, which is true when N goes to ∞ only if $s \geq 1/2$.

We now discuss the case $m \geq 2$ and $n = 1$. We use for $1 \leq k \leq m$

$$\widehat{f_k}(\xi_k) = \sum_{j=1}^N a_j(t_k) \widehat{\varphi}(N\xi_k - j),$$

and

$$\sigma_N = \sum_{j_1=1}^N \cdots \sum_{j_m=1}^N a_{j_1}(t_1) \cdots a_{j_m}(t_m) a_{j_1+\cdots+j_m}(t_{m+1}) c_{j_1+\cdots+j_m} \prod_{k=1}^m \phi(N\xi_k - j_k).$$

By an argument similar to the case $m = 2$ and $n = 1$, we have

$$\|f_k\|_{L^{p_k}(\mathbb{R} \times [0,1], dx dt)} \approx N^{\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{1}{2}},$$

$$\|\sigma_N\|_{L_s^r} \leq CN^s \text{ and}$$

$$(11) \quad \|T(f_1, \dots, f_m)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R})} \approx N^{\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}},$$

hence we obtain that $s \geq (m-1)/2$.

For the higher dimensional cases, we define

$$F_k(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \prod_{\tau=1}^n f_k(x_\tau),$$

and $\sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \prod_{\tau=1}^n \sigma_N(\xi_\tau)$, then $\|F_k\|_{L^{p_k}} \approx N^{n(\frac{1}{p_k} - \frac{1}{2})}$, $\|\sigma\|_{L_s^r} \leq CN^s$, and

$$\|T(F_1, \dots, F_m)\| \approx N^{n(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2})}.$$

We therefore obtain the restriction $s \geq (m-1)n/2$. \square

Proposition 9. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 2 we must have $s \geq mn/r$.*

Proof. Let φ and ϕ be as in Proposition 7. Define $\widehat{f_j}(\xi_j) = \widehat{\varphi}(N(\xi_j - a))$ with $|a| = 1$, and $\sigma(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) = \prod_{j=1}^m \phi(N(\xi_j - a))$, then a direct calculation gives $\|f_j\|_{L^{p_j}(\mathbb{R}^n)} \approx N^{-n+n/p_j}$ and $\|\sigma\|_{L_s^r(\mathbb{R}^{mn})} \leq CN^s N^{-mn/r}$. Moreover,

$$T_\sigma(f_1, \dots, f_m)(x) = N^{-mn}(\varphi(x/N)e^{2\pi i x \cdot a})^m.$$

We can therefore obtain that $\|T_\sigma(f_1, \dots, f_m)\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)} \approx N^{-mn+n/p} CN^s N^{-mn/r}$. Then we come to the inequality $N^{-mn+n/p} \leq CN^s N^{-mn/r} \prod_j N^{-n+n/p_j}$, which forces $s - mn/r \geq 0$ by letting N go to infinity. \square

Next, we obtain from (8) the restrictions for the indices p_j claimed in Theorem 3.

Proof. (Theorem 3) By symmetry it suffices to consider the case $I = \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ with $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and the explanation $I = \emptyset$ when $k = 0$. Define for $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\widehat{f_N}(\xi) = \sum_{j=-N}^N \widehat{\varphi}(N\xi - j)a_j(t), \quad \widehat{g_N}(\xi) = \sum_{j=-N}^N \widehat{\varphi}(N\xi - j),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma_N(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_m) \\ &= \sum_{j_1=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{j_m=-N}^N a_{j_1+\dots+j_m}(t) c_{j_1+\dots+j_m} a_{j_1}(t_1) \cdots a_{j_k}(t_k) \phi(N\xi_1 - j_1) \cdots \phi(N\xi_m - j_m). \end{aligned}$$

The idea is that in this setting if we take the first k functions as f_N and the remaining as g_N , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & T_{\sigma_N}(\overbrace{f_N, \dots, f_N}^{k \text{ terms}}, \overbrace{g_N, \dots, g_N}^{m-k \text{ terms}})(x) \\ &= \sum_{j_1=-N}^N \cdots \sum_{j_m=-N}^N a_{j_1+\dots+j_m}(t) c_{j_1+\dots+j_m} N^{-m} [\varphi(x/N)]^m e^{2\pi i x(j_1+\dots+j_m)/N}. \end{aligned}$$

This expression is independent of k and by (11) we know

$$\|T_{\sigma_N}(f_N, \dots, f_N, g_N, \dots, g_N)\|_{L^p} \approx N^{1/p-1/2}.$$

Previous calculations show also $\|f_N\|_{L^{p_i}} \approx C_{p_i} N^{1/p_i-1/2}$ and $\|\sigma_N\|_{L^r_s} \leq CN^s$. Lemma 4.3 in [6] gives that $\|g_N\|_{L^{p_i}} \leq C_{p_i}$ for $p_i \in (1, \infty]$. Consequently, we have

$$N^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}} \leq CN^{\sum_{i=1}^k (\frac{1}{p_i}-\frac{1}{2})} N^s$$

and this verifies our conclusion when $n = 1$.

For the higher dimensional case, we just use the tensor products and σ similar to what we have in Proposition 7, and thus conclude the proof. \square

Notice that when $k = m$, Theorem 3 coincides with Proposition 7.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. P. Calderón, A. Torchinsky, *Parabolic maximal functions associated with a distribution*, II. Adv. in Math. **24** (1977), no. 1, 101–171.
- [2] R. Coifman, Y. Meyer, *Commutateurs d'intégrales singulières et opérateurs multilinéaires*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **28** (1978), no. 3, xi, 177–202.
- [3] I. Daubechies, *Orthonormal bases of compactly supported wavelets*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **41** (1988), 909–996.
- [4] I. Daubechies, *Ten lectures on wavelets*, CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, 61. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1992.
- [5] L. Grafakos, D. He, P. Honzík, *Rough bilinear singular integrals*, submitted (2015).
- [6] L. Grafakos, D. He, P. Honzík, H. V. Nguyen, *The Hörmander multiplier theorem, I: the linear case*, submitted (2016).
- [7] L. Grafakos, D. He, H. V. Nguyen, L. Yan, *Multicommutators and multiplier theorems*, submitted (2015).
- [8] L. Grafakos, N. Kalton, *The Marcinkiewicz multiplier condition for bilinear operators*, Studia Math. **146** (2001), no. 2, 115–156.
- [9] L. Grafakos, A. Miyachi, N. Tomita, *On multilinear Fourier multipliers of limited smoothness*, Can. J. Math. **65** (2013), no. 2, 299–330.
- [10] L. Grafakos, Z. Si, *The Hörmander multiplier theorem for multilinear operators*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **668** (2012), 133–147.
- [11] L. Grafakos, R. Torres, *Multilinear Calderón-Zygmund theory*, Adv. Math. **165** (2002), no. 1, 124–164.
- [12] D. He, *On bilinear maximal Bochner-Riesz operators*, in preparation.
- [13] C. Kenig, E. M. Stein, *Multilinear estimates and fractional integration*, Math. Res. Lett. **6** (1999), no. 1, 1–15.

- [14] Y. Meyer, *Wavelets and operators*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **37**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.
- [15] A. Miyachi, N. Tomita, *Minimal smoothness conditions for bilinear Fourier multipliers*, Rev. Mat. Iberoam. **29** (2013), no. 2, 495–530.
- [16] C. Muscalu, J. Pipher, T. Tao, C. Thiele, *Bi-parameter paraproducts*, Acta Math. **193** (2004), no. 2, 269–296.
- [17] A. Seeger, *Estimates near L^1 for Fourier multipliers and maximal functions*, Arch. Math. (Basel) **53** (1989), no. 2, 188–193.
- [18] N. Tomita, *A Hörmander type multiplier theorem for multilinear operators*, J. Funct. Anal. **259** (2010), no. 8, 2028–2044.
- [19] H. Triebel, *Theory of function spaces. III, vol. 100 of Monographs in Mathematics*, 2006.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, COLUMBIA MO 65211, USA
E-mail address: grafakosl@missouri.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUN YAT-SEN (ZHONGSHAN) UNIVERSITY, GUANGZHOU, 510275,
P.R. CHINA
E-mail address: hedanqing35@gmail.com

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, CHARLES UNIVERSITY IN PRAGUE, KE KARLOVU
3, 121 16 PRAHA 2, CZECH REPUBLIC
E-mail address: honzik@gmail.com